

Lagrangian quantum turbulence model based on alternating superfluid/normal fluid stochastic dynamics

Shihan Miah and Christian Beck

Queen Mary University of London, School of Mathematical Sciences, Mile End Road, London E1 4NS, UK

Inspired by recent measurements of the velocity and acceleration statistics of Lagrangian tracer particles embedded in a turbulent quantum liquid we propose a new superstatistical model for the dynamics of tracer particles in quantum turbulence. Our model consists of random sequences S/N/S/... where the particle spends some time in the superfluid (S) and some time in the normal liquid (N). This model leads to a superposition of power law distributions generated in the superfluid and Gaussian distributions in the normal liquid, in excellent agreement with experimental measurements. We include memory effects into our analysis and present analytic predictions for probability densities and correlation functions.

The statistics of tracer particles embedded in a turbulent quantum liquid is an interesting area of current turbulence research [1]–[21]. Measurements of Paoletti et al. [1] have shown that the measured velocity distributions asymptotically exhibit a power law with exponent approximately given by -3 . This is in contrast to classical fully developed turbulence, where velocities are approximately Gaussian (but velocity *differences* and accelerations are strongly non-Gaussian [22]–[29]). Recent measurements of La Mantia and Skrbek [2] have illustrated that depending on the spatial scale probed there can be a mixture of quantum and classical features in the distributions. The measured velocity distributions in [2] again exhibit asymptotic power laws with exponent -3 , but superimposed to that appears a Gaussian core for low velocities. In [3], for the first time, also histograms of measured accelerations for particles embedded in turbulent quantum flow were presented, which appear to be of similar shape as those of accelerations in classical Lagrangian turbulence [22]. Numerical simulations of the velocity statistics based on the Gross-Pitaevskii equation have been performed in [4], also providing evidence for power-law tails. A simple model for the dynamics of test particles based on χ^2 -superstatistics (a method of nonequilibrium statistical mechanics [30–34]) was proposed in [5]. This model predicts power law tails with exponent -3 , and in addition yields further information on the shape of the probability density near the maximum. Effectively it leads to so-called q -Gaussian distributions [35–37] with entropic exponent $q = 5/3$.

In this paper we introduce a rather general but powerful stochastic model for the dynamics of a test particle in a turbulent quantum liquid, which, contrary to previous work, takes into account that there is a mixture of superfluid and normal liquid. Consequently, this new model is based on a mixture of two different statistics: One is related to the particle movement in the superfluid (S), leading to power law distributions, and one is based on the movement in the normal liquid (N), leading to a superimposed Gaussian. For a given test particle both phases alternate in a random sequence S/N/S/... If we attribute to each symbol a fixed time scale, then repetitions of the same symbol occur as well, e.g. SSNSNNSS....From

a statistical mechanics point of view our model has the form of a superstatistical stochastic differential equation [26, 29, 37] combined with a symbolic dynamics [38, 39]. From a condensed matter physics point of view the model has some analogy with regarding the quantum liquid as a spatial random collection of infinitely many S/N/S Josephson junctions [40, 41]. The symbol sequences generated by the test particle that moves through the quantum liquid have the ability to encode complex memory effects in the dynamics generated by the quantum turbulent flow.

We present results for the probability distributions generated by this model and compare with recent experimental data presented in [2, 3]. Excellent agreement is found. The model is simple enough to allow for analytical calculations of temporal correlation functions, and we present some results for the case of a generalized dynamics that also contains a memory kernel. So far Lagrangian correlation functions have not been measured experimentally in quantum turbulent flow, but future measurements in this direction would be very useful. If more experimental measurements on correlation functions were available this could help to further narrow down the most suitable class of stochastic models, and to better understand the symbolic dynamics generated by quantum turbulent flow.

Consider a tracer particle embedded in a quantum liquid that consists of a mixture of superfluid (S) and normal liquid (N). Consider a sequence (e.g. SNSNNSSSN....) where the local dynamics of the particle is different depending whether it is surrounded by liquid in phase S or N. In phase S we consider a superstatistical local dynamics [5, 37] where the velocity $\mathbf{v}$ of the tracer particle satisfies

$$\dot{\mathbf{v}} = -\gamma(t)\mathbf{v} + \omega[\mathbf{e}(t) \times \mathbf{v}] + \sigma(t)\mathbf{L}(t) \quad (1)$$

Here $\mathbf{L}(t)$ is vector-valued Gaussian white noise. We assume that the effective damping constant γ and the noise strength σ are functions of t , and so is ω and the direction of the unit vector $\mathbf{e}$, which is uniformly distributed. The second term on the right hand side of eq.(2) represent the rotational movement of the particle around the nearest vortex filament in direction $\mathbf{e}$. The unit vec-

tor $\mathbf{e}$ and the noise strength σ evolve stochastically on a large time scale T_e and T_σ respectively: In the superstatistics approach, one consider the *parameters* of a local stochastic differential equation to be random variables [37]. That is, the parameters in eq. (1) can take on very different values during time evolution. A very small γ corresponds to nearly undamped motion for a limited amount of time. A very small ω corresponds to almost no rotation, i.e. straight movement for a limited amount of time. All these cases are included as possible local dynamics and averaged over in the superstatistical approach. Due to the integration over probability densities in γ, ω, σ , eq. (1) yields non-Gaussian behavior represented by some non-Gaussian density function $p_S(\mathbf{v})$ (see later sections for concrete calculations).

Contrary to that, if the particle is surrounded by normal liquid (phase N), then we assume the dynamics is described by an ordinary Langevin equation with constant parameters γ_0 and σ_0 , leading to standard type of Gaussian behavior, as expected for the velocity of a test particle in classical liquids:

$$\dot{\mathbf{v}} = -\gamma_0 \mathbf{v} + \omega [\mathbf{e}(t) \times \mathbf{v}] + \sigma_0 \mathbf{L}(t) \quad (2)$$

This simple linear equation just yields Gaussian behaviour with inverse variance parameter $\beta_0 = 2\gamma_0/\sigma_0^2$ during phase N. If the variance is rescaled to 1, meaning we consider the velocity in units of its variance, then the stationary probability density in this case is simply

$$p_N(\mathbf{v}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}v^2}. \quad (3)$$

In our model we assume that *both* phases are relevant and for a given tracer particle occur in random (but not necessarily uncorrelated) sequences. Each tracer particle in the quantum liquid produces a temporal sequence of symbols S and N, which, depending on parameters of the quantum turbulent flow environment, the size of the test particle, and the time scales involved, will have different stochastic properties.

The simplest case is just statistically independent random sequences of symbols S and N. The probability density $p(\mathbf{v})$ of velocity of the tracer particle is then given in the mixed form

$$p(\mathbf{v}) = w_S p_S(\mathbf{v}) + w_N p_N(\mathbf{v}) \quad (4)$$

where w_S and w_N describe the probability of the symbol S, respectively N, to occur ($w_S + w_N = 1$). In other words, the relative duration of the two different phases is relevant. The probabilities w_S and w_N will depend on external parameters of the quantum liquid, as well as on the spatial and temporal scale on which the measurements are done. If the spatial scale probed by the test particle is larger than the average distance of vortex filaments, then we expect $w_N \approx 1$ to dominate, leading basically just to Gaussian behaviour. Nontrivial quantum turbulence properties are probed by very small test particles at very low temperature, leading to $w_S \approx 1$.

The assumption of independent random sequences of symbols will usually be too simple for a quantum liquid. For example, if the particle is trapped near a vortex core, then long-lasting sequences SSSSS... will occur, similar as the laminar phase for intermittent chaotic maps near a tangent bifurcation [38]. We propose to condition the probabilities w_S and w_N on the actual velocity of the test particle observed. This means we may consider conditioned probabilities $w_S|_v$ and $w_N|_v$, conditioned on a given observation of the velocity v , in the sense that given a large observed velocity v , $w_S|_v$ is close to 1, and in case a small velocity v is observed, $w_N|_v$ conditioned on that velocity is close to 1. This is plausible, because given a large velocity v it is very likely that this happened during a phase where the particle was being embedded by the superfluid and close to a vortex filament with rapid rotation. In this latter model, which has strong correlations between the observed value of v and the quantities w_S and w_N conditioned on the observed velocity, the probability density is given in good approximation by

$$p(\mathbf{v}) = \begin{cases} p_N(\mathbf{v}) & |v| \leq v_c \\ p_S(\mathbf{v}) & |v| > v_c, \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

because large velocities are almost sure to occur in phase S, and hence above a given threshold are distributed according to the tails given by $p_S(v)$. v_c is a critical velocity, whose value depends on the relative occurrence probabilities w_N and w_S : The larger w_S , the smaller v_c . For $w_S \rightarrow 1$, $v_c \rightarrow 0$. For $w_N \rightarrow 1$, $v_c \rightarrow \infty$.

Let us now work out more details on $p_S(\mathbf{v})$ in phase S. As in the experiments, we restrict ourselves to the statistics $p_S(v_i)$ of a single component v_i . For ease of notation, we suppress the index i in the following. We essentially follow the approach of [5]. Far away from a vortex filament, the typical velocity will behave as in classical turbulence, whereas close to a vortex filament the movement will be very rapid and almost friction free, as superfluids imply due to quantum mechanical constraints $v \sim 1/r$, where r is the distance of the particle to the nearest vortex core. Following the same argument as in ref. [5], we consider an effective friction dependent on the distance to the nearest vortex filament. One obtains for a χ^2 -distributed effective friction $\gamma(t)$ of n degrees of freedom (and under the assumption of a uniform distribution of rotation axis vectors $\vec{e}$)

$$p_S(v) = \frac{\Gamma(\frac{n}{2} + \frac{1}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{n}{2})} \left(\frac{\beta_0}{\pi n} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{1}{\left(1 + \frac{\beta_0}{n} v^2 \right)^{\frac{n}{2} + \frac{1}{2}}}. \quad (6)$$

The typical velocity of the tracer particle in the S phase depends on the perpendicular distance between the particle and the nearest evolving (and sometimes merging) vortex filament. Therefore, the relevant degrees of freedom are $n = 2$ for 3-dimensional quantum turbulence, since the distance to a 1-dimensional vortex line has two components. In experiments there is often a drift velocity in the system that gives a non-zero mean velocity c

to the test particle. In this case one has to replace v by $v - c$ in Eq.(6) and (3), and for $n = 2$ one ends up with

$$p_S(v) = \frac{\sqrt{\beta_0}}{(2 + \beta_0(v - c)^2)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \quad (7)$$

Clearly, for large v this implies power-law tails

$$p_S(v) \propto v^{-3}. \quad (8)$$

For the above distribution p_S , the variance does not exist, so in practice one introduces a cutoff v_{max} , so that the variance is well-defined [5]. This cutoff is also physically motivated, one typically observes in experiments values of the velocity up to about 15 standard deviations [2].

Let us now compare our model predictions with recent experimental measurements performed by La Mantia *et al.* [2, 3]. The experimental data obtained in [3] are to a certain extent different from previous seminal measurements published by Paoletti *et al.* in [1] due to the fact that the investigated flows are different. La Mantia *et al.* conducted their experiment on steady-state thermal counterflow, while in [1] it was mainly decaying thermal counterflow. Moreover, the used techniques in both experiments were different, for example, different tracer particles were employed and the probed heat flux range was also not the same. Therefore, one expects similar results for the measured $p(v)$ rather than exactly the same results. Our model can describe the experimental data obtained by both groups, assuming that for the experiment [1] $w_N \approx 0$ (see [5] for a fit) whereas for the measurements in [2, 3] larger values of w_N are relevant, depending on the scale probed.

The PDFs of velocities of tracer particles measured in [2, 3] have power law tails but superimposed there is also a near-Gaussian distribution in the central part. These measurements agree well with the prediction of our S/N/S model with strongly conditioned $w_S|_v$ and $w_N|_v$, leading to formula (5). An excellent agreement is obtained, as shown in Fig.1. The critical velocity v_c (in units of the standard deviation) is about $v_c \approx 4$, whereas for the data of Paoletti *et al.* [1] it is close to zero (see fit in Fig. 1 in [5]), meaning that in those measurements the particle is much more frequently in the S-phase.

Let us now move on from Lagrangian velocities to Lagrangian accelerations. La Mantia *et al.* [3] also measured the probability density function of vertical particle accelerations in the quantum turbulent flow, see also [42] for a recent update. They report that the tails of the density function become more pronounced as the temperature decreases and as the heat flux of the thermal counterflow increases. Again we expect an interplay between a different statistics for the normal phase N and the superfluid phase S of the embedded test particle. However, for the acceleration statistics the normal phase N will play a more important role than the phase S since the frictionless superfluid does not exhibit strong forces on the test particle. The cascade of energy dissipation is




FIG. 1: Experimental data of La Mantia *et al.* [3] and a fit using eq. (7), (5) and (3) with $\beta_0 = 4.5$ and $c = 0.3$ for the tail part (blue solid line), as well as a Gaussian with mean 0.3 and variance 1 for the central part.

also similar in quantum turbulence as compared to classical turbulence [20], so that the acceleration environment of a Lagrangian test particle is quite similar to the case of classical turbulence, at least on scales of the same order of magnitude as the average distance between quantized vortices. Hence, we basically expect a similar acceleration statistics in the quantum turbulent flow as for classical Lagrangian turbulence since quantum effects on the acceleration are small. For the acceleration statistics we may thus essentially consider superstatistical models than have been successfully applied before to reproduce acceleration statistics in classical turbulent flow, such as [29]. These are based on lognormal superstatistics [31]. The prediction of these types of models is that the PDF of acceleration components is given by

$$p(a) = \frac{1}{2\pi s} \int_0^\infty \beta^{-1/2} \exp \left[\frac{-\left(\log \frac{\beta}{b}\right)^2}{2s^2} \right] e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta(a-c)^2} d\beta \quad (9)$$

The above probability density function given by Eq. (9) is in excellent agreement with the experimental measurements of La Mantia *et al.* [3], as shown in Fig. 2.

For a more detailed understanding it is important to measure not only histograms of velocities and accelerations, but also 2-point and higher correlation functions. Depending on time scale, and the spatial scale probed by the test particles, as well as the temperature of the quantum liquid, the symbol sequences SNSSS... will have memory effects, as mentioned before. Under simple model assumptions our approach allows us to calculate the two-point correlation function analytically. First, let us slightly generalize eq. (1) by introducing a memory kernel. This allows for non-Markovian effects in the quantum liquid, represented by memory effects in the symbol sequences. The more general local dynamics in-




FIG. 2: Experimental measurements of histograms of accelerations (in units of the standard deviation) obtained by La Mantia *et al.* [3], and the Lognormal Superstatistics distribution given by Eq.(9) with $s^2 = 2.2$, $b = e^{\frac{1}{2}s^2}$, $c = 0.12$.

cluding memory reads

$$\dot{\mathbf{v}} = -\gamma \mathbf{v} + \alpha \int_{-\infty}^t dt' e^{-\eta(t-t')} \mathbf{v} + \omega [\mathbf{e}(t) \times \mathbf{v}] + \sigma(t) \mathbf{L}(t). \quad (10)$$

Taking $\eta \rightarrow \infty$ in Eq. (10), one can obtain the previous local dynamics without memory kernel. Equivalently, the same dynamics can be obtained by putting $\alpha = 0$. The dynamics described by Eq. (10) without rotational term has been studied by Van der Straeten *et al* [43] and it was found to be very useful to reproduce experimental data of turbulent Taylor-Couette flow.

For simplicity, let us first consider the direction of rotation to be represented by $\mathbf{e} = (0, 0, 1)$. Then Eq. (10) reduces to

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{v}_x &= -\gamma v_x - \omega v_y + \alpha \int_{-\infty}^t dt' e^{-\eta(t-t')} v_x(t') + \sigma L_x(t) \\ \dot{v}_y &= -\gamma v_y + \omega v_x + \alpha \int_{-\infty}^t dt' e^{-\eta(t-t')} v_y(t') + \sigma L_y(t) \\ \dot{v}_z &= -\gamma v_z + \alpha \int_{-\infty}^t dt' e^{-\eta(t-t')} v_z(t') + \sigma L_z(t) \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Introducing a complex variable by defining $u(t) = v_x(t) + i v_y(t)$ and $g(t) = L_x(t) + i L_y(t)$, the first two equations of Eq. (11) can be written as

$$\frac{du}{dt} = -(\gamma - i\omega)u + \alpha \int_{-\infty}^t dt' e^{-\eta(t-t')} u(t') + \sigma g(t) \quad (12)$$

To ease our calculations we introduce another variable by defining $Y = \alpha \int_{-\infty}^t dt' e^{-\eta(t-t')} u(t')$ and then rewrite Eq. (12) as a two-dimensional system of differential equations as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{u} &= -(\gamma - i\omega)u + Y + \sigma g(t) \\ \dot{Y} &= -\eta Y + \alpha u(t) \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

This form of the equations is helpful to perform numerical simulation as well as to calculate the stationary distribution of the system.

In two-dimensional classical turbulent point vortex dynamics correlation behaviour that is well fitted by a sum of two exponentials has been observed (Fig. 4 in [44]). Correlation functions in three-dimensional quantum turbulence are constrained by the quantization condition and expected to be of similar complexity as in the two-dimensional point vortex case. One may thus conjecture that similar shapes of correlation functions are relevant. This we will derive now.

Using Fourier transformations in Eq. (13), we obtain

$$\langle u^*(t)u(0) \rangle = \oint \frac{\sigma^2(\eta^2 + z^2) dz e^{izt}}{\pi [(\gamma - i\omega - iz)(\eta - iz) - \alpha] [(\gamma + i\omega + iz)(\eta + iz) - \alpha]} \quad (14)$$

Here, $u^*(t)$ is the complex conjugate of $u(t)$. As a special case for $\alpha = 0$ and $\omega = 0$ one can easily obtain the correlation function $C_v(t) = \langle v_x(t + \tau)v_x(t) \rangle$ from Eq. (14) as $C_v(t) = \frac{\sigma^2}{2\gamma} e^{-\gamma t}$. Similarly for $\alpha = 0$ one obtains $C_v(t) = \frac{\sigma^2}{2\gamma} e^{-\gamma t} \cos(\omega t)$.

For non zero α and ω a longer calculation to evaluate the integral given by Eq. (14) yields the following form of the correlation function:

$$\begin{aligned} C_v(t) &= \frac{\sigma^2 e^{-Dt}}{2\sqrt{\mathcal{R}QD}} \left[\Pi \cos(Ct - \theta) + \Upsilon \sin(Ct - \theta) \right] \\ &+ \frac{\sigma^2 e^{-D't}}{2\sqrt{\mathcal{R}QD'}} \left[\Pi' \cos(C't - \theta) - \Upsilon' \sin(C't - \theta) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Here the parameters are given as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{R} &= \left[\omega^2 - (\gamma - \eta)^2 - 4\alpha \right]^2 + 4\omega^2(\gamma - \eta)^2 \Big]^{1/2} \\
\theta &= \frac{1}{2} \tan^{-1} \left[\frac{2\omega(\gamma - \eta)}{\omega^2 - (\gamma - \eta)^2 - 4\alpha} \right] \\
C &= \frac{1}{2} \left[\omega + \sqrt{\mathcal{R}} \cos(\theta) \right] \\
D &= \frac{1}{2} \left[\gamma + \eta + \sqrt{\mathcal{R}} \sin(\theta) \right] \\
C' &= \frac{1}{2} \left[\omega - \sqrt{\mathcal{R}} \cos(\theta) \right] \\
D' &= \frac{1}{2} \left[\gamma + \eta - \sqrt{\mathcal{R}} \sin(\theta) \right] \\
Q &= (\gamma + \eta)^2 + \mathcal{R} \cos^2(\theta) \\
\Phi &= \eta^2 + C^2 - D^2 \\
\Phi' &= \eta^2 + C'^2 - D'^2 \\
\Pi &= \Phi \sqrt{\mathcal{R}} \cos(\theta) + 2CD(\gamma + \eta) \\
\Pi' &= \Phi' \sqrt{\mathcal{R}} \cos(\theta) - 2C'D'(\gamma + \eta) \\
\Upsilon &= \Phi(\gamma + \eta) - 2CD\sqrt{\mathcal{R}} \cos(\theta) \\
\Upsilon' &= \Phi'(\gamma + \eta) + 2C'D'\sqrt{\mathcal{R}} \cos(\theta)
\end{aligned}$$

The numerically simulated correlation function from the Langevin dynamics for non-zero parameters ω , γ , σ and η and the analytic result (15) are plotted in Figs. 3 and 4. As expected the results are in good agreement. Similar shapes of autocorrelation functions of velocity components are observed in atmospheric turbulence [44–46]. Our results for the shape of correlation functions remain valid if $\sigma(t)$ fluctuates in a superstatistical way, in this case σ^2 is simply replaced by its average $\langle \sigma^2 \rangle$. Similarly, if different dynamical parameters are assumed in the S- and N-phases, one can average the correlation function over these. It would be very interesting to check in future Lagrangian quantum turbulence measurements whether shapes of correlation functions similar to those predicted in Fig. 3 and 4 are observed.

To summarize, in this paper we have constructed a model for the dynamics of tracer particles in quantum turbulent flow, based on a mixture of contributions from the superfluid (S) and the normal fluid (N). We discussed the symbolic dynamics generated by the symbol sequences consisting of S and N. We showed that the model generates velocity statistics of the tracer particle that obeys a power law $p(v) \propto v^{-3}$ for large v , together with a Gaussian core in the central region. The relative contribution of both densities is determined by the statistics of the symbols S and N. When the velocity is small the particle is more likely to be driven by the normal fluid. For very large velocities it is much more likely to be surrounded by superfluid and to be, in fact, close to a vortex core. Our analytic results are in very good

agreement with recent experimental data [1–3]. We also showed that the acceleration statistics is well fitted by




FIG. 3: Correlation function of a single velocity component as predicted by the generalized dynamics given in Eq. (15) for $\gamma = 0.1$, $\sigma = 1.0$, $\omega = 0.3$ and $\alpha = 0.0$. Red (data points) and green (solid lines) colours represent analytical and numerical results respectively.




FIG. 4: Same as Fig. 3 but with memory effect, $\gamma = 0.1$, $\sigma = 1.0$, $\omega = 0.5$ and $\alpha = -0.05$

lognormal superstatistics, in a similar way as observed for classical Lagrangian turbulence [22, 29].

To better understand memory effects in the symbolic dynamics, we extended our model by introducing a memory kernel so that the two-point correlation function of the velocity component can capture more complicated dynamics. We presented analytic results for the correlation function. The general correlation function was shown to decay as a sum of two exponentials with oscillatory behaviour. Future experimental measurements of correlation functions of tracer particles could help to single out the optimum class of stochastic models, and to better understand the properties of the symbolic dynamics of quantum turbulent flow as a function of the external control parameters.

-
- [1] M. PAOLETTI, M. FISHER, K. SREENIVASAN, AND D. LATHROP, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101** 154501 (2008).
- [2] M. LA MANTIA AND L. SKRBEK, Europhys. Lett. **105**, 46002 (2014)
- [3] M. LA MANTIA, D. DUDA, M. ROTTER, AND L. SKRBEK, J. Fluid Mech. **717**, 1469(2013).
- [4] A.C. WHITE, C.F. BARENGHI, N.P. PROUKAKIS, A.J. YOUNG, AND D.H. WACKS, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104** 075301 (2010).
- [5] C. BECK AND S. MIAH, Phys. Rev. E **87**, 031002(R) (2013).
- [6] H. ADACHI, M. TSUBOTA, Phys. Rev. B **83** 132503 (2011).
- [7] T. ARAKI, M. TSUBOTA, AND S.K. NEMIROVSKII, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89** 145301 (2002).
- [8] C. NORE, M. ABID, AND M.E. BRACHET, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78** 3896 (1997).
- [9] M. KOBAYASHI AND M. TSUBOTA, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94** 065302 (2005).
- [10] N.G. PARKER AND C.S. ADAMS, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95** 145301 (2005).
- [11] M. KOBAYASHI AND M. TSUBOTA, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76** 045603 (2007).
- [12] D.R. POOLE, C.F. BARENGHI, Y.A. SERGEEV, AND W.F. VINEN, Phys. Rev. B. **71**, 064514 (2005).
- [13] C.F. BARENGHI, Physica D **237**, 2195 (2008).
- [14] P.M. CHESLER, H. LIU, AND A. ADAMS, Science **341**, 368 (2013)
- [15] M.S. BORGAS, T.K. FLESCHE, AND B.L. SAWFORD, J. Fluid Mech. **332**, 141 (1997).
- [16] M.S. PAOLETTI, R.B. FIORITO, K.R. SREENIVASAN, AND D.P. LATHROP, J. Phys. Soc. Japan **77**, 111007 (2008)
- [17] M.S. PAOLETTI AND D. LATHROP, Ann. Rev. Cond. Matt. Phys. **2**, 213 (2011)
- [18] Y.A. SERGEEV, S. WANG, E. MENEGUZZI AND C.F. BARENGHI, J. Low Temp. Phys. **146**, 314 (2007)
- [19] D. KIVOTIDES, C.F. BARENGHI, AND Y.A. SERGEEV, Phys. Rev. B **77**, 015127 (2008)
- [20] J. SALORT, B. CHABAUD, E. LÉVÊQUE, AND P.-E. ROCHE, Europhys. Lett. **97** 34006 (2012).
- [21] A.W. BAGGALEY AND C.F. BARENGHI, arXiv:1110.5767v2.
- [22] A. LA PORTA, G. A. VOTH, A. M. CRAWFORD, J. ALEXANDER, AND E. BODENSCHATZ, Nature **409** 1017 (2001).
- [23] A. M. REYNOLDS, N. MORDANT, A. M. CRAWFORD, AND E. BODENSCHATZ, New Journ. Phys. **7** 58 (2005).
- [24] N. MORDANT, P. METZ, O. MICHEL, AND J.-F. PINTON, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87** 214501 (2001).
- [25] N. MORDANT, E. LEVEQUE, AND J.-F. PINTON, New Journ. Phys. **6** 116 (2004).
- [26] C. BECK, Europhys. Lett. **64** 151 (2003).
- [27] A.M. REYNOLDS, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91** 084503 (2003).
- [28] A.M. REYNOLDS, M. VENEZIANI, Phys. Lett. A **327** 9 (2004).
- [29] C. BECK, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98** 064502 (2007).
- [30] C. BECK, E.G.D. COHEN, Physica A **322** 267 (2003).
- [31] C. BECK, H.L. SWINNEY, AND E.G.D. COHEN, Phys. Rev. E **72** 056133 (2005).
- [32] H. HASEGAWA, Phys. Rev. E **83** 021104 (2011).
- [33] R. HANEL, S. THURNER, AND M. GELL-MANN, PNAS **108** 6390 (2011).
- [34] V. GARCIA-MORALES, K. KRISCHER, PNAS **108** 19535 (2011).
- [35] C. TSALLIS, J. Stat. Phys. **52** 479 (1988).
- [36] M.S. RIBEIRO, F.D. NOBRE, AND E.M.F. CURADO, Phys. Rev. E **85**, 021146 (2012).
- [37] C. BECK, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87** 180601 (2001).
- [38] C. BECK AND F. SCHLÖGL, *Thermodynamics of Chaotic Systems*, Cambridge University Press (1993).
- [39] T. TÉL, Z. Naturforsch. **43a**, 1154 (1988).
- [40] P. DUBOS ET AL., Phys. Rev. B **63**, 064502 (2001).
- [41] C. BECK, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 231801 (2013).
- [42] M. LA MANTIA AND L. SKRBEK, Phys. Rev. B **90**, 014519 (2014).
- [43] E. VAN DER STRAETEN AND C. BECK, Physica A **390**, 951 (2011).
- [44] C. PASQUERO, A. PROVENZALE, AND A. BABIANO., Journal of Fluid Mechanics, **439**, 279 (2001).
- [45] A.M. REYNOLDS, Physica D **172**, 124 (2002).
- [46] A.M. REYNOLDS, Physica D **218**, 185 (2006).